1 HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 7 ROBERT C. JARVIS and RETHA D. JARVIS, 8 Husband and Wife, Case No. 3:16-CV-05194-RBL 9 Plaintiffs, VS. 10 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE 11 ASSOCIATION, a federal corporation; THE FEES BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, F.K.A. THE 12 BANK OF NEW YORK, AS TRUSTEE FOR **NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:** CWHEW, INC., HOME EQUITY LOAN ASSET FRIDAY, MAY 12, 2017 (LCR 7(d)(3)) 13 BACKED CERTIFICATES, SERIES 2006-s10; and MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC 14 REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC., Delaware corporation 15 Defendants. 16 Motion. A. 17 Plaintiffs ROBERT C. JARVIS and RETHA D. JARVIS, Husband and Wife, move for an 18 award of \$11,062.50 for attorneys' fees. This motion is supported by the Declaration of Gregory F. 19 Amann in Support of Motion for Attorneys' Fees filed herewith. 20 B. Discussion. 21 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2) establishes the procedure for asserting a right to 22 attorneys' fees and "related nontaxable expenses" where there is an independent source of authority 23 24 for such awards. MRO Communications, Inc. v. American Tel. & Tel. Co., 197 F.3d 1276, 1281 (9th

Cir. 1999). Unlike Rule 54(d)(1) which expressly preempts state law relating to specified costs, Rule 54(d)(2) does not limit the operation of state law procedures. Thus, in diversity actions, state law governs the recovery of attorneys' fees and related nontaxable expenses so long as it does not run counter to a valid federal statute or rule of court. *Garcia v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 209 F.3d 1170, 1177 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000).

Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to RCW 4.84.330, which provides:

In any action on a contract or lease entered into after September 21, 1977, where such contract or lease specifically provides that attorneys' fees and costs, which are incurred to enforce the provisions of such contract or lease, shall be awarded to one of the parties, the prevailing party, whether he or she is the party specified in the contract or lease or not, shall be entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees in addition to costs and necessary disbursements.

Attorneys' fees provided for by this section shall not be subject to waiver by the parties to any contract or lease which is entered into after September 21, 1977. Any provision in any such contract or lease which provides for a waiver of attorneys' fees is void.

As used in this section "prevailing party" means the party in whose favor final judgment is rendered.

Fannie Mae's deed of trust provides that "Lender shall be entitled to recover its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in any action or proceeding to construe or enforce any term of this Security Instrument." In order for a contractual attorneys' fee provision to apply under RCW 4.84.330, the contract containing the attorneys' fee provision must be "central to the controversy." *Hemenway v. Miller*, 116 Wn.2d 725, 742, 807 P.2d 863 (1991). The central issue of this case was the enforceability of Fannie Mae's deed of trust. Attorneys' fees were awarded pursuant to RCW 4.84.330 under similar facts in *Kirsch v. Cranberry Financial, LLC*, No. 69959-8-I, 2013 WL 6835195 (Wn. App. Div. I 2013). In *Kirsch*, plaintiff filed a quiet title action under RCW 7.28.300

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Dkt. #39 (Fannie Mae's Response to Motion for Summary Judgment, Exhibit B at 16).

24

claiming that the statute of limitations had run on defendant's promissory note and deed of trust because defendant did not take action to enforce the note and deed of trust within six years after acceleration of the debt. *Id.* at \*2. The court held that the statute of limitations had indeed run, and awarded the plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to RCW 4.84.330 based on a provision in the promissory note providing that the debtor shall pay the note holder's expenses of any nature, including reasonable attorney fees and costs, incurred to enforce the note's provisions. *Id.* at \*7. The language of RCW 4.84.330 is mandatory and does not allow for an exercise of discretion in deciding whether to award fees. *Farm Credit v. Tucker*, 62 Wn. App. 196, 207, 813 P.2d 619 (1991).

## C. Conclusion

Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court award them attorneys' fees in the amount of \$11,062.50 against Defendant Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae).

Dated this 25th day of April, 2017.

VSI Law Group, PLLC

By: /s/Gregory F. Amann Gregory F. Amann, WSBA No. 24172

225 Tacoma Avenue South Tacoma, WA 98402 253-922-5464 gfa@vsilawgroup.com

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 2 I certify on the date indicated below I caused a copy of the foregoing document to be filed 3 with the clerk of the Court via the CM/ECF system. In accordance with their ECF registration 4 agreement and the Court's rules, the Clerk of the Court will send email notification of such filing to 5 the attorneys of record. 6 7 I affirm under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington and the United 8 States that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. 9 SIGNED April 25, 2017, at Tacoma, Washington. 10 11 /s/ Gregory F. Amann By: Gregory F. Amann, WSBA No. 24172 12 gfa@vsilawgroup.com 13 225 Tacoma Avenue South 14 Tacoma, WA 98402 15 T: 253-922-5464 F: 253-212-3963 16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Robert C. Jarvis 17 and Retha D. Jarvis 18 19 20 21 22 23 24